

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are pending. By this Response, claims 1, 5 and 9 are amended and claims 13-25 are added. Reconsideration and allowance based on the above amendments and following remarks are respectfully requested.

Abstract

The Office Action objects to the abstract for not complying with MPEP §608.01(b). Applicants respectfully submit that the new abstract provided in this Response fully complies with MPEP §608.01(b). Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Prior Art Rejections

The Office Action rejects claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Okazaki, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,745,220). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Okazaki discloses an image frame selecting apparatus for a photographic printer that receives film and provides a print from the image on the film. In processing the film, one of three (3) print modes can be selected. The print modes include an auto print mode, a pre-judged print mode and a manual print mode. Okazaki does not specifically state on how the selection of the print modes are made. It appears, however, that such a selection is made by an operator. In any

case, Okazaki does not teach that a judgment is made based upon order information whether the print should be printed by an automatic operator or a manual operator, as recited in applicant's independent claims 1, 5 and 9.

Further, Okazaki's system selects various frames for processing and arranges these frames in a specified order. The Office Action alleges that this information concerning the order arrangement of the frames corresponds to applicants claimed order information. Applicants respectfully submit that the order of information, as understood from the specification, refers to information such a processing number indicating the content of the service, an image number indicating an image, a print size, a print quantity, the quality of print paper, thickness of the print paper, the content of the photographic processing and trimming information. See page 3 of the specification. The order information claimed by applicants does not refer to the arrangement of certain image frames as taught in Okazaki.

Also, Okazaki fails to teach transferring the order information via a network as recited in claims 2, 6 and 10. Okazaki teaches that the data communication circuits may be used. However, Okazaki does not teach or suggest such communication circuitry being used in conjunction with a network and specifically for order information, as claimed.

In view of the above, applicants respectfully submit that Okazaki fails to anticipate applicant's independent claims 1, 5 and 9 and dependent claims 2, 6 and 10. Further, dependent claims 3, 4, 7, 8, 11 and 12 are also distinguishable

over Okazaki for the reasons stated above. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that applicant's claims are distinguishable over the cited art. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Chad J. Billings (Reg. No. 48,917) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Appl. No. 09/686,789

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 

Michael K. Mutter, #29,680

MKM/CJB:cb
2091-0221P

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

Attachment(s)